



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/543,061	07/21/2005	Tatchiko Inoue	MAT-8708US	3932
23122	7590	12/11/2008	EXAMINER	
RATNERPRESTIA P.O. BOX 980 VALLEY FORGE, PA 19482			ABRAMS, NEIL	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2839	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/11/2008	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/543,061

**Applicant(s)**

INOUE ET AL.

**Examiner**

Neil Abrams

**Art Unit**

2839

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 July 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-42 and 44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 15-17 and 23-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 16 and 32-44 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB-08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7-21-2005
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

Parent case listing added to page 1 filing date required

1. Claims 16, 32-44 are objected to, claim 16 recites "the case" without antecedent basis.

Claims 32-44 included since dependent from claim 10. Claim 38 dependency incorrect.

1. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Japan (171324) in view of Bauer and Jakoubovich (Jak).

2. Japan figures 3, 4, 6, 10 assembly includes a holder formed by parts 12, 20, 20, 30 etc for sandwiching and retaining plural capacitors A and includes a pcb 10 connected to the capacitors, but does not show a circuit pattern on the pcb or connection in series. Use of a circuit pattern is standard and series connection for two capacitors taught by Bauer, see abstract, and series / parallel taught by Jak. Obvious to use such series or parallel connection in Japan device since the capacitors in series or parallel is critical in each case depending on their function in the circuit.

3. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Japan 345262 in view of Hayasi, Martin, Jakobovitch (Jak) and Bauer.

4. Japan unit includes capacitors 1, 1, pcb 3, for connecting to the capacitors and a holder formed by cradles 52 joined as shown in figure 6 and mounted on the pcb, figure 7. Japan does not clearly show a circuit board pattern and a series or parallel connection. It is obvious that the pcb must include a pattern as taught by Hayasi at 21a as necessary for it to function and also obvious to use series or parallel connection as in Jak column 3, lines 60-63 or in series as in Bayer as such connections are dependent on intended function of the capacitors in the circuit. While Japan holder figure 6 adequate, Martin added to further show cradles 130 with teaching

that they could be joined as single unit column 3, lines 45-50. Therefor should Japan teachings in this regard be at issue, also obvious to so form Japan holders 52 as a double cradle for easier assembly onto the pcb.

5. Claims 15-17, 23-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the references as applied to claim 1, directly above, and further in view of Wiezorek and Haun.

6. \For claims 15-17 also obvious to includes control circuit as in Wezorek at 8, 9 and Haun and to provide for charging and discharging of the capacitor as in Haun as these are standard expedients used in motor control assemblies like that of Japan and also obvious to also use an I/O connector as is standard and as also suggested by Wiezorek at 6, 15. Claims 23-27 refer to features that appear as not related to main invention concept and these are considered obvious variations.

7. Claims 2-4, 6-14, 18-20, 28-30 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Neil Abrams at telephone number 571-272-2089

/Neil Abrams/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2839